Volusia County Schools

Atlantic High School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

Demographics

Principal: Jason Watson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	97%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (51%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	SIG Cohort 3
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Atlantic High School

1250 REED CANAL RD, Port Orange, FL 32129

http://www.atlanticsharks.com/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	61%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Atlantic High School, personal responsibility is an essential component of our curriculum. In order to emphasize and teach personal responsibility, we believe that teachers, students, and parents must clearly understand the role each must play in helping every one of our students to achieve academic success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Atlantic High School, every person is treated with dignity and respect. We welcome and encourage students, families, staff and community to learn together. Our students develop their unique talents to graduate with the greatest treasure—enthusiasm for lifelong learning as responsible, creative citizens.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Alves, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Curriculum
Hinson, Stephen	Principal	School Principal
Culver, Tracia	Assistant Principal	Data & Testing
Eschen, Brian	Assistant Principal	Safety & Security, Facilities
Sparger, KImberly	Instructional Coach	Math Coach
Rich, Stacie	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach
Thompson, Althia	Assistant Principal	ESE
Cromer, Kristina	Administrative Support	Dean of Discipline

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	407	358	277	260	1302
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	43	52	48	183
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	6	6	21
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	97	72	59	351

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	20	16	13	73

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

83

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/9/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	31	39	26	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90	48	31	31	200
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	53	67	42	199
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	123	97	72	59	351

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	59	48	36	229

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	50%	52%	56%	43%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	49%	51%	43%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	37%	42%	38%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	48%	48%	51%	52%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	49%	48%	48%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	38%	45%	40%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	81%	76%	68%	70%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	62%	69%	73%	65%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	407 (0)	358 (0)	277 (0)	260 (0)	1302 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	40 ()	43 ()	52 ()	48 ()	183 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	6 (0)	21 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	123 (0)	97 (0)	72 (0)	59 (0)	351 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
	2018	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	50%	50%	0%	53%	-3%
	2018	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	72%	6%	67%	11%
2018	79%	65%	14%	65%	14%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	63%	-4%	70%	-11%
2018	52%	63%	-11%	68%	-16%
Compare		7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	54%	-12%	61%	-19%
2018	41%	57%	-16%	62%	-21%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	55%	-6%	57%	-8%
2018	60%	55%	5%	56%	4%
Compare		-11%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	41	45	27	45	50	48	37		79	9
ELL		50									
ASN										100	55
BLK	36	50	47	31	48	39	67	45		81	18
HSP	42	36	21	43	38		63	52		67	58
MUL	53	58		47	45		73			69	27
WHT	56	54	52	56	51	59	87	73		86	45
FRL	42	48	50	43	51	53	75	56		80	35
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	23	38	28	22	21	12	46	21		80	29
BLK	28	37	21	32	32	25	58	30		93	30
HSP	49	43	40	48	44	45	83	50		80	69
MUL	59	50		57	58		100			92	45
WHT	58	51	33	63	56	41	88	67		90	62
FRL	44	42	28	47	45	35	77	50		82	49
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	15	37	31	26	34	31	53	39		73	13
BLK	23	27	22	31	41	33	52	40		85	34
HSP	43	36	31	54	50		86	85		87	40
MUL	35	38		63	40						
WHT	54	52	53	60	51	44	77	74		82	49
FRL	36	39	38	48	46	40	66	60		79	40

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	633
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

One of our low areas was in math achievement at 48% of students at proficiency in large part due to our Geometry scores, down 12% from last year. Staffing and lack of proper PLC work played a role in these scores. Our ELA lower quartile performance was a low area at 48% but an 18% increase from last year. Our SWD proficiency was at 40% and we attribute this to lack of proper collaborative practices and ineffective ESE case management in some areas. 9th grade ELA dropped from last year by 4% due in large part to new staffing. 10th grade ELA was at 50%; a 5% increase, but still an area of concern as it is below the state average.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Our Geometry proficiency dropped by 12% although it continues to be above the district average. Staffing and lack of proper PLC work played a role in these scores

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The area with the largest gap in relation to the state average is our US History EOC scores at 62%, a full 11% lower than the state average. It was an area where we increased by 6% from last year due to a new PLC team that meets weekly and is using OP common assessment data to inform instruction. We hope to see that trend continue.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Most improved areas was out lower quartile learning gains in ELA - an 18% increase from last year and our lower quartile performance in math - a 14% increase. The teachers were provided with specific professional learning to understand learning gains, and identify and monitor their specific lower quartile population. They were also provided training on targeted interventions and support for lower quartile students. Additionally we began classroom based data chats & goal setting in all ELA/ Math classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Concern is always the number of students already identified as EWS as 9th grade as well as the number of juniors and seniors at risk. We have a high number of 9th and 10th grade students with 2 or more early warning indicators (73 total). Those students will need additional supports and progress monitoring. It is also concerning to see the high level of students 9-12th grade (351 total) that are identified as level 1 on FSA - that is 25% of our student population.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA proficiency
2. Math proficiency
3. Graduation Rate
4. SWD proficiency rates
5. Lower Quartile Progress

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our ELA Proficiency was at 50% which was below the state average. Our ELA Learning Gains were 51% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 48%. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students meeting with proficiency ELA. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, only performed at 16%, well below the district and state averages.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA proficiency from 50% to 55%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-aligned instruction (Teacher Clarity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success for all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers will participate in VCS Professional Leaning Plan 2. Atlantic will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and our SIP goal 3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with their PLC and access PLC framework/resources. PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans. 4. Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up 5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning 6. Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching. 7. School will implement a schedule for ELA data chats 8. Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction
Person Responsible	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our Math Proficiency was at 48% which was below the state average. 44% of students met with proficiency in Algebra and 49% in Geometry. Our Math Learning Gains were 50% and the Lowest Quartile performed at 50%. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students meeting with proficiency in Math. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, only performed at 27%, well below the district and state averages.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math proficiency from 48% to 53%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards-aligned instruction (Teacher Clarity)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher clarity has a .75 effect size according to John Hattie. Teacher Clarity is a research-based process for narrowing and focusing activities, cutting away aspects of instruction that don't help learning by identifying the most critical parts of instruction: learning intentions, success criteria, and learning progressions. With an effect size of .75, Teacher Clarity can double the rate of student learning, according to Hattie. It supports the goal of creating Assessment-Capable Learners who are three times more likely to achieve in school resulting in improved attendance, engagement, retention, progress, and success for all learners.

Action Step	
Description	1. All teachers will participate in VCS Professional Leaning Plan 2. Atlantic will engage teachers in a professional learning plan based on school data and our SIP goal 3. Teachers will engage in structured PLCs and use TEAMS to collaborate with their PLC and access PLC framework/resources. PLC work will include monitoring of SWD data and documentation of support in PLC minutes/lesson plans. 4. Administration and academic coaches will provide PLC support and follow up 5. Teachers will implement knowledge and skills learned from professional learning 6. Administration and academic coaches will monitor the implementation of skills from PL, provide feedback and follow up coaching. 7. School will implement specific technology (Aleks, Algebra/Geometry Nation, Kahn Academy) to support students 8. Student surveys will be implemented each semester to collect feedback from students on the quality of instruction
Person Responsible	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Graduation Rate
Rationale	As a result of our Needs Assessment and Analysis it revealed that our graduation rate dropped to 83%, below the state average. Our SLT has decided to focus on increasing the overall number of students' graduation from Atlantic in 4 years or less. Further analysis revealed that students with disabilities; an ESSA targeted group, had a graduation rate of 79%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase graduation rate from 83% to 89%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention has a 1.29 effect size according to John Hattie. Response to Intervention (RTI) is a multi-tier approach to the identification and support of students with learning, behavior and attendance concerns. The RTI process begins with high-quality instruction and screening of all in the general education classroom. Struggling learners are provided with interventions and supports at increasing levels of intensity to accelerate their rate of learning.

Action Step	
Description	1. Problem Solving Team Coordinator for EARLY identification of students in need of additional supports 2. Graduation Assurance Coach to provide monitoring and support of seniors at risk 3. Quarterly "Shark Attacks" with administration and guidance for senior data chats, progress monitoring, and goal setting 4. Senior data room to track and monitor senior progress with specific focus on SWD 5. D/F report reviewed quarterly to begin early intervention for underclassmen 6. Tutoring programs/use of Edgenuity for credit recovery /interventions 7. Weekly reports submitted to guidance on seniors in danger of failing to include parent contacts and interventions 8. ACT prep in 11/12 grade intensive reading classes 9. PERT prep embedded in 11th & 12th grade remedial math courses 10. Case management for SWD to include data chats & graduation progress monitoring
Person Responsible	Stephen Hinson (schinson@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).